IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of	:	Attorney Docket No. 2006_0560A
Oddvin REISO et al.	:	**Confirmation No. 1717**
Serial No. 10/576,108	:	Group Art Unit 1793
Filed July 17, 2006	:	Examiner Jie Yang
Al-Mg-Si ALLOY SUITED FOR EXTRUSION	:	**Mail Stop: AF**

RESPONSE TO FINAL REJECTION

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Responsive to the Office Action of June 3, 2010, Applicants submit the following remarks in support of the patentability of the presently claimed invention over the disclosures of the references relied upon by the Examiner in rejecting the claims. Further and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of these remarks.

Thus, the rejection of claims 5, 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parson et al. (US '359) in view of Ohyama et al. (US '090) is respectfully traversed.

Applicants continue to rely on their previous arguments concerning the patentability of the presently claimed invention over these references.

The Examiner argues, on page 3 of the Official Action, that the major composition ranges disclosed by US'359, referring to Table 1, the claims and examples, overlap the composition ranges of the present invention. The Examiner fails, however, to indicate which composition ranges are overlapping. The claims, Table1 and examples of US'359 do not overlap the specified ranges of Mg and Mn as defined in claim 5 of the present application. Thus, claim 1 of US'359 specifies Mg in the range of 0.20 - 0.34 wt%, while claim 5 of the present application defines Mg between 0.35 and 0.5 wt%. Further, claim 1 of US'359 suggests Mn in the range 0.02 - 0.15 wt%, while the present invention defines a quite narrow range of between 0.03 and 0.06 wt% for Mn.

The USPTO is hereby authorized to charge any fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16, 1.17, and 1.492, which may be required by this paper to Deposit Account No. 23-0975.